

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed July 26, 2005, indicating the Amendment filed July 19, 2005 was considered non-compliant because Claim 13, labeled “Currently Amended”, did not reflect any changes. The foregoing section has been corrected to reflect that Claim 13 specifies text that was “Previously Presented.” Hence, it is believed this Amendment is in proper form.

The following is a duplicate of the remarks submitted July 19, 2005, for the Examiner’s convenience.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 8 are amended, and claims 1-13 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-12 were stand rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,778 to Fung and U.S. Patent No. 6,199,137 to Aguilar. The Final Action stated on page 6 that “[i]f the Applicant intends that the entries enjoy a particular correspondence with the packets, this distinction is not supported in the claims.” The Final Action also stated on page 7 that “the limitations do not require each and every packet to have a corresponding entry.”

Based on the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to explicitly specify the storage of “entries identifying respective packets wherein each entry identifies a corresponding one of said packets” in order to explicitly establish a one-to-one correspondence between the packets (having been transmitted as claimed) and the entries stored in the table.

Hence, the claims as amended explicitly establish a one-to-one correspondence between the entry and a corresponding packet. As described in the Amendment filed February 1, 2005 (the arguments of which are incorporated in their entirety herein by reference), Fung et al. neither discloses nor suggests the claimed storage of entries identifying respective packets, wherein each entry identifies a corresponding one of said packets, as claimed. Fung et al. stores TMC blocks on a per-transaction basis, where each transaction may include a plurality of data packets (see previous citations to col. 3, lines 4-8; col. 10, lines 47-50; col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 5; col. 11, lines 41-50; and col. 17, line 63 to col. 18, line 6, as well as the accompanying arguments on pages 8-10 of the Amendment filed February 1, 2005).

Amendment filed August 1, 2005

Appln. No. 09/824,706

Page 6

Hence, Fung et al. teaches retransmitting the entire transaction, which would include packets for which a reply already has been received: Fung et al. neither discloses nor suggests the claimed storing “entries identifying respective packets wherein *each entry identifies a corresponding one of said packets*”, as claimed, and the addition of Alvaro to the hypothetical combination provides no additional teaching that is relevant, hence the hypothetical combination fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature of storing “entries identifying respective packets wherein *each entry identifies a corresponding one of said packets*”.

For these and other reasons, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a) or 1.17(e), to Deposit Account No. 50-0687, under Order No. 95-391, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Manelli Denison & Selter, PLLC



Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

Customer No. 20736
Date: August 1, 2005

Amendment filed August 1, 2005

Appln. No. 09/824,706

Page 7